

## **REMARKS**

Applicant has studied the Final Office Action dated July 9, 2009. Claims 1, 4-6, 9, and 11-14 are pending. Claims 1, 6, 13, and 14 have been amended in compliance with 37 CFR § 1.116(b) to more clearly claim disclosed embodiments. Claims 1 and 6 are independent claims. No new matter has been added as the amendments have support in the specification as originally filed. For example, support for the amendments to claims 1 and 6 can be found, at least, in paragraph [0035] of the specification as originally filed.

It is submitted that the application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

### **§ 103 Rejections**

Claim 1, 4-6, 9, and 11-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ranagan et al. ("Ranagan" US 6,154,771) in view of Bruckhaus (US 6,052,492). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With regard to the rejection of independent claims 1 and 6, the Examiner asserts, on page 5 of the Office Action, that the scope of the "time interval" is not defined or limited in the claims. The Examiner asserts, on pages 3 and 5, that Ranagan teaches that scene changes are detected at a "time interval" of 0.5 seconds. The Examiner further asserts that while this time interval is small (15 frames or 0.5 seconds) and might result in all of the scene changes being detected, the claim limitations do not limit the time interval, and thus, Ranagan reads on the claim language. Furthermore, the Examiner suggests amending claims in order to narrow the scope and to distinguish over Ranagan because the Examiner believes that claims 1 and 6 do not forbid the detection of all scene changes (the likely result in Ranagan).

Independent claims 1 and 6, as amended, recite that the plurality of thumbnail images are extracted from the broadcasting stream at a scene change point within each editing section which comprises a plurality of groups of pictures. It is respectfully submitted that the amendments to claims 1 and 6 address the above identified concerns of the Examiner with respect to the time interval. It is further respectfully submitted that

amended claims 1 and 6 are clearly distinguishable from the cited references as none of the cited references discloses or suggests that the plurality of thumbnail images are extracted from the broadcasting stream at a scene change point within each editing section and each editing section comprises a plurality of groups of pictures, as recited in independent claims 1 and 6.

Accordingly, it is respectfully asserted that independent claims 1 and 6 are allowable over the cited combination of references. It is further respectfully asserted that claims 4-5 and 13, which depend from independent claim 1, and claims 9, 11, 12, and 14, which depend from independent claim 6, also are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from their respective allowable base claims.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, Applicant submits that all pending claims of the present application are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein; and no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned agent at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (213) 623-2221 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

LEE, HONG, DEGERMAN, KANG & WAIMEY

Date: August 20, 2009

By: /Harry S. Lee/  
Harry S. Lee  
Registration No. 56,814

Customer No. 035884